

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
FORT WAYNE DIVISION**

ANTHONY C. MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

**DUPONT HOSPITAL, and
HEATHER STULTZ,**

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CAUSE NO. 1:09-CV-00047

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court in this action advancing various civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is a filing by *pro se* Plaintiff Anthony C. Martin entitled “The Exercise of Jurisdiction Local Rule 72.1(h) & 73 of F.R.C.P.” (Docket # 31.) Construing the filing liberally, it is a motion to compel. Martin, however, in his three-page filing never specifically identifies what information he seeks with respect to discovery. Rather, after espousing several jurisdictional theories, he simply asks the Court in the last sentence of the filing to compel Defendants to “answer the plaintiff’s discovery request”. Consequently, the Court is unable to definitively discern which of Defendants’ discovery responses Martin thinks are inadequate. Therefore, Martin’s motion will be denied. *See, e.g., Morris v. Ley*, No. 05 C-0458, 2006 WL 2585029, at *2 (E.D. Wis. Sep. 7, 2006) (denying *pro se* plaintiff’s motion to compel because it was “nearly impossible to ascertain which documents the plaintiff seeks to have produced”).

Furthermore, at the scheduling conference on September 9, 2009, this Court limited discovery to jurisdictional issues until January 12, 2010, with the filing of dispositive motions advancing a jurisdictional challenge by February 12, 2010. (Docket # 22.) Thus, to the extent

Martin is asking the Court to compel responses to discovery requests that exceed the scope of jurisdictional issues, Martin's motion is without merit.

Therefore, Martin's motion to compel (Docket # 31) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Enter for this 29th day of January, 2010.

/S/ Roger B. Cosbey
Roger B. Cosbey,
United States Magistrate Judge